

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated May 2, 2005, please consider the following remarks.

In the Office Action issued May 2, 2005, claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (Lee), U.S. Patent No. 6,336,137. Claims 4, 12, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Major et al. (Major), U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0073626 A1. Claims 5-8, 13-16, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, in view of Major, and further in view of Dutta et al. (Dutta), U.S. Patent No. 6,615,212.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-19, and 21-24 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter that the inventor considers to be the invention and to include the content of claims 4, 12, and 20. Correspondingly, claims 5, 13, and 21 have been amended to refer to the appropriate claims. Claims 4, 12, and 20 have been canceled. New claims 25-27 have been added.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to amended claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17-19 are not anticipated by Lee. Lee discloses a client-server systems and methods for transferring data via a network, including a wireless network, between a server and one or more clients or browsers that are spatially distributed (i.e., situated at different locations). Lee discloses a web server that provides WWW content (such as HTML) and using a filter to translate the WWW content into WAP content, for example translating HTML into WML. The mapping between

languages is direct and automatic, with no analysis performed on the initial content beyond simply scanning the data.

By contrast, the present invention, according to claim 1 (or, correspondingly, claim 9 or claim 17) requires that the content be analyzed so that an appropriate translation method is chosen for a specific mobile device. This translation is not necessarily the direct translation of WWW content to WAP content disclosed by Lee, which lacks the step of the analysis of the content and the receiving device, wherein the data to be translated is selected from the totality of the content, a translation scheme is chosen based upon the content and the receiving mobile device, and the translation is performed. In addition, the present invention, according to claim 1 (or, correspondingly, claim 9 or claim 17) requires that the translatable content comprise at least one form that requests information from the user. Lee does not disclose or suggest such a form, and Lee does not disclose or suggest translating such a form.

Further, the applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 5-8, 13-16, and 21-24 is not obvious over Lee in view of Major and further in view of Dutta. Major discloses an information browser system and method that enables sending of information requests to remote information sources and receiving of requested information from the remote sources on a wireless communication device. Information in any of a plurality of formats, including WML, HTML, and WML- Script, is converted into a format in which the information can be displayed or otherwise further processed by the device. Dutta discloses a method in a data processing system for providing content from a distributed database to a client. A transcoding proxy server receives a request for content from a client machine, retrieves the content from an originating server, and

transcodes the content from the first format type into the second format type, and sends the content in the second format to the client. Neither Major nor Dutta discloses or suggests any sort of analysis to be performed upon the content, but rather disclose the same sort of direct, unanalyzed translation as discussed in Lee. Further, neither Major nor Dutta discloses or suggests translating a form, as required by the present invention.

Thus, the combination of Lee, Major, and Dutta still fails to disclose or suggest the required elements of scanning of content to locate translatable content, translatable content comprising at least one form that requests information from the user, analyzing that content to determine a translation scheme appropriate to a specific mobile device, and then translating the content.

In addition, the present invention, according to new claims 25-27, requires that the form is filled-in with information relating to the user before being translated. None of Lee, Major, and Dutta discloses or suggests this requirement. Likewise, any combination of Lee, Major, and Dutta still fails to disclose or suggest this requirement.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to define an invention that is novel and nonobvious over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.


Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0061).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: September 1, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500